

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
TRANSPORTATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

October 25, 2012

Maricopa Association of Governments Office  
302 North First Avenue, Suite 200, Saguaro Room  
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Scottsdale: David Meinhart, Chair	Maricopa County: John Hauskins
Avondale: David Fitzhugh, Vice-Chair	Mesa: Jeff Martin for Scott Butler
ADOT: Kwi-Sung Kang for Floyd Roehrich	Paradise Valley: Jim Shano
#Buckeye: Scott Lowe	Peoria: Andrew Granger
Chandler: Dan Cook for Patrice Kraus	Phoenix: Rick Naimark
El Mirage: Sue McDermott	Queen Creek: Troy White
Fountain Hills: Randy Harrel	Surprise: Bob Beckley
Gila Bend: Eric Fitzer	Tempe: Chad Heinrich
*Gila River: Doug Torres	Valley Metro: John Farry
#Gilbert: Leah Hubbard	*Wickenburg: Rick Austin
Glendale: Terry Johnson	Youngtown: Grant Anderson for Lloyce Robinson
Goodyear: Cato Esquivel	
*Guadalupe: Gino Turrubiarres	
*Litchfield Park: Woody Scoutten	

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING

*Street Committee: Charles Andrews, Avondale	*Bicycle/Pedestrian Committee: Katherine Coles, City of Phoenix
ITS Committee: Debbie Albert, Glendale	*Transportation Safety Committee: Julian Dresang, City of Tempe

\* Members neither present nor represented by proxy.    + - Attended by Videoconference  
# - Attended by Audioconference

OTHERS PRESENT

Eric Anderson, MAG	David Johnson, Buckeye
John Bullen, MAG	Robert Reiss, Gannett Flemming
Monique De Los Rios-Urban, MAG	Win Holden, Grand Canyon State Logo Signs
Bob Hazlett, MAG	Phil Matthews, SRPMIC
Sarath Joshua, MAG	Jennifer Jack, SRPMIC
Teri Kennedy, MAG	Chris Hagen, Tolleson
Nathan Pryor, MAG	
Felicia Calderon, ADOT	
Lars Jacoby, ADOT	
Mike Sabatini, Baker	

## Call to Order

Chairman David Meinhart from the City of Scottsdale called the meeting to order at 10:01 a.m.

### 1. Approval of Draft June 28, 2012 Minutes

Chairman Meinhart asked if there were any changes or amendments to the June 28, 2012 meeting minutes, and there were none.

Mr. Jeff Martin from the City of Mesa motioned to approve the minutes. Mr. Rick Naimark from the City of Phoenix seconded, and the motion passed by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

### 2. Approve Draft minutes of the August 23, 2012 meeting

Chairman Meinhart asked if there were any changes or amendments to the August 23, 2012 meeting minutes, and there were none.

Mr. Chad Heinrich from the City of Tempe motioned to approve the minutes. Mr. Rick Naimark from the City of Phoenix seconded, and the motion passed by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

### 3. Call to the Audience

Chairman Meinhart announced that he had not received any cards requesting to speak and moved on to the next item on the agenda.

### 4. Transportation Director's Report

Chairman Meinhart invited Mr. Eric Anderson, MAG Transportation Director, to provide the Transportation Director's Report.

Mr. Anderson reported that sales tax information for September which is August business activity. September revenue is up 2.2%. August had increased by 5.2% and July by 7.1%. First quarter revenue is up 4.8% however, revised Highway User Revenue Fund (HURF) or Regional Area Road Fund (RARF) have not been received at this time but is expected to be completed fairly soon.

Mr. Anderson stated that HURF revenue is up .5% over last year however, it is currently tracking below forecast. Diesel use was down 3.5% and BLT down significantly at 5%. These numbers reflect lack of growth for the last three or four years.

Mr. Eric Anderson said that Map-21 passed and was signed by the President in July, however, guidance items were still not available. MAG planned to meet with ADOT on future of federal funds forecast regarding TIP and plan assumption.

Mr. Eric Anderson communicated that under Federal Transportation law, MPO boundaries have to include contiguous urban areas based on 2010 census which would include the San Tan Valley

area. That is the minimum that would need to be included however, there may be additional areas. MAG is continuing conversations with Florence, Maricopa and Pinal County. This matter is expected to be resolved in the next two or three months.

Mr. Anderson addressed a request last month by Mr. Grant Anderson for an update on MAP-21. Given the number of agenda items on the meeting today and that additional guidance is still being provided, this update will be provided in the December meeting.

Mr. Martin inquired if the Risk Analysis Process (RAP) to review and provide input for the input variables used for the revenue forecasts has been completed. Mr. Anderson responded that RAP sessions were completed in August and that projections for HURF and RARF should be forthcoming this fall. Mr. Kang added that ADOT staff is currently conducting the analysis and the finance group is expected to finalize it in the next few weeks.

#### 6. Arterial Life Cycle Program Project Removal and Gilbert Road Light Rail Extension

Chairman Meinhart invited Mr. Eric Anderson, MAG Transportation Director, to discuss Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) Project Removal and Gilbert Road Light Rail Extension.

Mr. Anderson said the item was on the agenda to support the recommendation by MAG Transportation Policy Committee and Regional Council. The Regional Council approved yesterday for the process being discussed to move forward. It's been 10 years since the Regional Transportation Plan for the Prop 400 vote and many things have changed including shift toward rail in Mesa. Mr. Anderson summarized the Mesa proposal as referenced in the PowerPoint:

- Extend light rail from Mesa Drive to Gilbert Road (1.9 miles)
- Remove 16 projects from the Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP)
- Reallocate federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) to fund LRT extension
- Mesa will provide necessary financing to match project needs to expected revenue stream
- Payments to Mesa are subject to ALCP schedule changes

LRT ridership has been very successful, exceeding all projections. The latest ridership number was about 50,000 last month. The Sycamore station accounts for about 10% of all ridership end of line station. Ridership has increased by about 16% the past year and is also the largest park and ride lot in the system. Mesa believes that this provides better use of limited transportation funds.

Provides better use of limited transportation dollars

- Increases ridership in Mesa by 40 percent
- Provides better access from Loop 202, US-60, as well as central and east Mesa
- Provides opportunity for redeveloping portions of Main Street from just east of Mesa Drive to Gilbert Road
- Provides a better site for a long-term park & ride lot at Gilbert Road
- Improves transit access for nearby residents with access to growing regional LRT system

The extension will greatly expand the reach of transit to attract new riders and connect central and east mesa will increase ridership. Central Mesa extension will increase ridership by about

4,500 and the Gilbert extension will add another 4,000 adding a total of 8,500 weekday riders to the system.

Mr. Anderson referred to the PowerPoint to discuss the funding approach, which include:

- Regional sales tax funds cannot be moved between programs but federal funds can be moved.
- Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds can be used for transit projects.
- Mesa has identified federally funded, Mesa ALCP street projects that are low priority or are unlikely to be completed.
- Mesa will issue financing since project funding requirements and schedule of federal funds are not aligned.
- Payments to Mesa will be subject to ALCP schedule adjustments.
- Addition of light rail extension of over one-mile triggers RTP Major Amendment Process

Mesa will be issuing Transportation Project Advancement Notes (TPANs), and that bond will be repaid from future transportation funds. Given the project adds more than 1 mile, there needs to be an amendment per Arizona state law.

Two roadways of significance to be discussed are Higley Road and Meridian Road Parkway. Many of the street projects have been or will be built by developers in the future. And some of the projects are no longer needed or may not be feasible. Meridian Road, the boundary between Maricopa and Pinal County, is not needed at this time. It was originally intended to be a Phase 4 project. With the economic slowdown, Mesa believes it can be deleted. In the future there will have to be some joint work between Maricopa and Pinal County as well as resolving some major drainage issues.

Higley Parkway was initially six lanes arterial street that would carry more traffic than a typical arterial and would have grade separated intersections. This concept does not work because of the neighborhood impacts. The volume is around 10-15k and can be handled by the exiting roadway. Many future arterial improvements will be developer responsibilities or have been built by developers. As shown in the map, portions of Baseline and Guadalupe Road that border developed properties have now been approved and the sections that border vacant properties will be completed as the properties are developed, at the expense of the developers. These conditions would not have been foreseen 10 years ago.

Regarding projects that are no longer necessary, cost of these improvements are justified given the low projected traffic volume. The Country Club Drive and Brown Road is an Intersection Improvement which would result in three through lanes. Brown west of Country Club Drive turns into local collectors therefore those additional through lanes are not needed. On Thomas Road from Gilbert Road to Val Vista, the undeveloped land indicates that the road is not really needed at this point.

The project cost reflects \$133 million with \$112 in construction costs and \$21 million in interest. The City of Mesa would be responsible for the 5.7% local match for federal funds, which they have available. They would also be responsibility for on-going operations and maintenance cost. Revenue service is scheduled for 2017, assuming action by MAG Regional Council to fund the project. Mesa and METRO would like to see it combined with the current existing project.

The recommendation to move forward was approved by Regional Council yesterday. MAG is starting the consultation process for a major amended process. This request includes a formal action and written response by State Transportation Board, the Regional Transportation Authority. The Maricopa Board of Supervisors will have a 30 day notice for comment. The cities and towns, Indian community and CTOC have the ability to provide comment at the willingness of the jurisdictions but it is not mandatory. The process started at Transportation Policy Committee, who put the plan together. Since it is policy shift from streets to transit, it seemed appropriate to start at policy level. Following consultation process action, we anticipate approval in January 2013 through the MAG committee process with the action in January 2013, following the Major Amendment Consultation, to amend the RTP and TIP to incorporate the changes, pending air quality conformity. After the air quality conformity finding, the action to amend the TIP and RTP would be in February 2013. The Regional Council action and not the action to recommend approval, to support for the changes to the project as described, and for the related amendments and modifications to the FY 2011-2015 MAG Transportation Improvement Program, and as appropriate, to the Regional Transportation Plan 2010 Update.

Mr. John Hauskins – understand the planning behind that. Maricopa will not fund Meridian Road without help. Pinal may not be able to in the future. ADOT has plans to put half of the traffic interchange at Meridian Road and U.S. 60 and that may generate more traffic. Mr. Fitzhugh inquired about the consequence of the support TRC on this project. Mr. Anderson replied none. But the committee is requested to weigh in on the discussion either through the stated or an amended motion.

Mr. Fitzhugh expressed concern that given the funding scenario assumes future scenario on STP and the uncertainty regarding future highway federal funds, what would happen if revenue does not meet projections, specifically who would be responsible for repayment of the TPANs. Mr. Anderson replied that the only obligation is from only the City of Mesa. There is no reach-through such that anyone else is responsibility. The City understands the risks from the federal funds which is the reason behind they are subject to the same adjustments in ALCP as if they are in ALCP. This process is similar to changes made to freeway schedule, such that repayments are moved around.

Mr. Fitzhugh asked if the federal funds are not as projected whether it is the intent to program outside the current RTP as we move into the next transportation plan. Mr. Anderson said that if necessary financing debt would be delayed to 2026, much like other projects.

Mr. Grant Anderson questioned the cost of the projects eliminated from the ALCP. Mr. Eric Anderson said \$153 million worth of projects was removed from the program. Mr. Grant Anderson wanted to know where does the money moved to and if helped balance the ALCP. Mr. Eric Anderson said that the funds will be going to City of Mesa. The ALCP includes STP and other Federal Funds but only STP funds are being flexed to transit for the light rail project. Prop 400 funds are not included and only STP funds are freed up from this policy recommendation.

Mr. Jeff Martin explained that City of Mesa has done many of these accelerated projects in the past while this is the first time they have moved ALCP funds to transit. Other moves include advancing projects in advance of planning and repaying when the funds were available. The city has a provision in the agreement that lays out the obligation of different parties, such that Mesa is subject to advances or decline in funding in the same way as all other projects in the ALCP program. The funds are advanced more because they are spread out. If there is a delay, Mesa

would pay additional interest. Mesa is setting aside more money than necessary by moving \$153.4 in ALCP funds for a \$132 million project. There is a \$40 million dollar contingency fund. If there is a delay, Mesa could handle it due to the \$40 million contingency. This project is very high priority to the Mayor and Council. The 16 ALCP projects were low priority to the City. Many are built by developers, including McKellips Road, Baseline Road, Guadalupe Road. Fifty to sixty percent of the streets have been built to design. In other cases, the development hasn't occurred so they're not completed. For example, Meridian Road, we thought it would be necessary but there is not a need right now. There is no a traffic load to justify it; we had thought they would be developed much faster.

Mr. Dan Cook asked if the action by Regional Council only addressed STP funds, given that Mesa has other CMAQ funds. Mr. Anderson replied that the action only included STP funds. There are still projects for Mesa in ALCP. Mr. Cook said that given that STP funds are the most flexible where as CMAQ is limited on street side, perhaps it may be an opportunity to swap STP and CMAQ keeping the funds in the appropriate years. Mr. Anderson replied the option to transfer CMAQ funds in lieu of STP can be reviewed after this phase is completed. However, there may be additional complications in transferring funds. If that is decision supported by all member agencies, it may be reviewed for further discussion. At this time, Regional Council action only states STP and that was the intent but this option can be explored further in the process.

Mr. Terry Johnson stated his support for the endeavor, however he expressed concerns to the policy setting implications of the move. The shift from ALCP to transit decreased the local match from 30% to 5.7% with 100% interested reimbursement. Meanwhile, the freeway program reimburses at 50/50 under that highway acceleration policy.

Mr. Randy Harrel questioned the availability of a park and ride. Mr. Martin replied that the project proposal includes a Park and Ride at Gilbert with 600 and 700 spaces part of cost estimate.

Mr. Fitzhugh asked if Mesa intended to come back to MAG to reprogram in the ALCP the unnecessary projects when development occurs in those areas. Mr. Martin said no because they will mostly be completed by developers. The exception was perhaps the one at Meridian Road and that project will not be during Prop 400.

Mr. Fitzhugh stated that while the City of Avondale did not receive any ALCP funds they did benefit from I-10 widening and SR-303. They would have liked some ALCP funds to work on street projects.

Mr. Dan Cook moved to support the motion.

Mr. Dave Meinhart commented that Mr. Johnson brought up some good points. The share of ALCP vs. transit is mitigated due to operation costs. However, 100% reimbursement of interest is new. Mr. Anderson stated that this is not a project acceleration but a move of funding from the street program to transit. Chairman Meinhart noted that interest repayment is a concern.

Mr. Cook motioned to approve action of Transportation Policy Committee with consideration of use of CMAQ in addition to STP. Mr. Johnson seconded the motion.

Mr. Naimark said he supported the need to shift and change based on economy and ideas about how to get from one place to another, especially with the success of the light rail. He also mentioned that he did not understand the local match and interest.

Mr. Eric Anderson responded that although 30% is the requirement for ALCP projects, 5.7% local match is the minimum requirement for federal funds. Given that Mesa will be responsible for all operating costs, it mitigates the difference. Interest reimbursement is included in the ALCP. On highway projects, the cost of financing split between jurisdiction and region 50/50. The rationale behind the highway program is because the region is benefitting the interest expense is shared. This is a transfer of funds and Mesa is responsible for the reimbursement.

Mr. Grant Anderson said that the mode transfer sets a precedent and that the interest increased the cost. Perhaps a 50/50 share should be discussed. Mr. Martin stated that under legislation, TPANs allowed a city to advance any project in the program. Any city or county that wants to advance with TPANs with interest are eligible for reimbursement. It is available to all member agencies.

Mr. Fitzhugh requested a clarification of motion regarding CMAQ. Mr. Cook explained the intention to use as much CMAQ as possible to release STP to eligible projects.

Mr. Farry stated that if the discussion had been to move to another street or freeway this discussion would not have occurred. Light rail has been very successful for transportation and economic development.

Mr. Naimark requested clarification of motion to include exploring the use of CMAQ funds.

Mr. Cook said it was for consideration to allow CMAQ transfers in lieu of STP as MAG moves forward in this process.

Chairman Meinhart asked if there were any additional comments, and there were none.

The motion to support for the changes to the project as described, and for the related amendments and modifications to the FY 2011-2015 MAG Transportation Improvement Program, and as appropriate, to the Regional Transportation Plan 2010 Update with for consideration to allow CMAQ transfers in lieu of STP passed by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

5a. Project Changes - Amendment and Administrative Modifications to the FY 2011-2015 MAG Transportation Improvement Program

This agenda item was taken out of order.

Chairman Meinhart invited Mr. Bob Hazlett, MAG Senior Engineer, to provide an introduction.

Mr. Bob Hazlett, MAG Senior Engineer, explained the additional funds were design for Loop 101 general widening from Red Mountain Freeway to Shea Boulevard and additional design money for Loop 303 El Mirage Road traffic interchange. Mr. Hazlett mentioned that MAG does have a material change policy but only for construction dollars and if construction exceeded a certain amount there is formal process for that. But on design side, staff is looking at process

with ADOT policy for design dollars. Mr. Hazlett introduced Ms. Chaun Hill as the head of project management.

Chairman Meinhart invited Ms. Chaun Hill to provide background on the project. Chairman Meinhart stated that the project change sheet indicated extensive coordination with Scottsdale staff and having checked with staff and there has been no coordination he could uncover. From the Scottsdale perspective he did not know where the cost estimates are from.

Ms. Hill responded on the Loop 101 project, the ICAM overhead and staff charges together have increased over 500,000. Additional cost of the Freeway Management System (FMS) and landscaping make up bulk of the difference. The project includes widening of the arterial. The widening including cutting into land form graphics which then needed to be reshaped. The FMS including a simple pathway was to shut down FMS system, but we currently plan to keep it with traffic control events. The Loop 101 increased ICAM, staff charges, and design for the FMS system, and landscaping and irrigation system for the increased width of the auxiliary lane.

Chairman Meinhart questioned the landscaping going south on 90th interchange and whether the plan included moving walls south of Shea Boulevard.

Ms. Hill said they were not moving walls, but to keep auxiliary lanes in place there are irrigation and landscaping issues.

Chairman Meinhart noted the City was hoping to conserve funds in this corridor to improve some of the interchanges in the system.

Mr. Johnson moved to approve the amendments and administrative modifications to the FY 2011-2015 MAG Transportation Improvement Program, Arterial Life Cycle Program, and as appropriate, to the Regional Transportation Plan 2010 Update. Mr. Kang seconded and the motion passed with unanimous voice vote of the committee.

#### 7. Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community Project Change Request

Chairman Meinhart invited Ms. Teri Kennedy MAG Transportation Improvement Program Manager, to discuss the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community Project Change Request.

Salt River Pima Indian Community (SRPMIC) contacted MAG staff and requested modification to their PM-10 paving project. They are requesting the funding to be split into right-of-way (ROW) and construction phases and a 2nd deferment to the projects based on elements outside of the community's control. Ms. Kennedy introduced Ms. Jennifer Jack to discuss the elements including financial commitment of community, updated schedule; and provided an overview of advantages of approving this project.

Ms. Jennifer Jack from SRPMIC discussed the paved dirt road project and referred to a map of the project area. She explained the ADT for Dobson Road has been reduced from over 400 vehicles per day to almost 0 due to a road closure by SRP. From the Dobson Road closure, ADT had increased on adjacent roads. The original project length of 5.36 miles is maintained by extending Mesa Drive and Center Street to replace Dobson Road and to address the shifted ADT.

At the time of application, the community assumed there was ROW for all the roadways they



were including but during the ROW verification process, excepted portions were found in grant of easement. They attempted to work around constraints but ADOT and FHWA would not allow the project to move forward without acquiring all segments of missing ROW.

Given ROW is eligible for CMAQ, the request is for funds to be moved to ROW purchase which would give the community time to identify additional funds during construction phase.

- Right of way is an eligible expense with CMAQ funds and will expedite the project.
- Project viability can be maintained by utilizing CMAQ funds for the right of way phase and SRPMIC can program additional construction funds.
- The project can be completed by deferring the construction to 2015 and allowing sufficient time for right of way acquisition.

#### Proposed updated schedule

- Project was originally scheduled to be authorized for construction by 9/18/2012.
- Due to the right of way acquisition, the new authorization date for construction is 7/1/2015.
- ADOT and their consultant agree that the schedule can be met.

#### Requested schedule

- Remove Dobson Road and increase the length on Mesa Drive and Center Street to maintain 5.36 miles.
- Reprogram \$1M of the construction funds for right of way acquisition in FY 2013. SRPMIC will contribute additional funding in construction phase.
- Defer the construction to FY 2015.

Mr. Hauskins stated his support for the request.

Mr. Cook also stated his support but expressed concern that the Streets Committee has a working policy for funding asphalt not ROW acquisition although CMAQ is eligible for ROW. The Streets Committee supported moving ahead with the project but that the community fund ROW and put all federal funds towards paving. Use the 2.5 million dollars allocated towards construction phase.

Chairman Meinhart expressed concern that this request is going outside two operating MAG guidelines with shift of funds to ROW and allowing a 2nd deferral.

Mr. Hauskins motioned to approve the changes to the project as described, and for the related amendments and modifications to the FY 2011-2015 MAG Transportation Improvement Program, and as appropriate, to the Regional Transportation Plan 2010 Update. Mr. Martin seconded the motion. The motion passed by majority voice vote with Chairman Meinhart voting no.

#### 8. 2012 Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Strategic Plan

Chairman Meinhart invited Ms. Debbie Albert, City of Glendale and Mr. Sarath Joshua, MAG ITS Program Manager, to present the 2012 Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Strategic Plan.

Debbie Albert, Chair of ITS Committee introduced the ITS Strategic Plan and stated that ITS Committee helped develop the plan and is very supportive of it. The previous plan was developed back in 2001 and needed to be updated. The ITS committee felt that a new plan was needed to address several items: 1) flexibility to allow agencies at various stages of the deployment to adhere to the plan, 2) accommodate technology growth, 3) allow for changes in local priorities. The document will also guide in the TIP programming process as funding goals and priority factors have been established. She pointed out that the plan has created a strategy for the expansion of ITS technology while meeting the needs of all agencies in the region. She introduced Sarath Joshua, who provided a brief presentation on this item.

Mr. Joshua referred to ITS being the acronym for Intelligent Transportation Systems and that refers to technology applications that help improve transportation operations and safety on freeways, arterials, transit and it also addresses bicycle, pedestrian and freight transportation. He stated that one chapter of the MAG Regional Transportation Plan is titled Systems Management and Operations and it describes investments in ITS infrastructure to improve traffic operations in the region. The ITS Committee provides technical oversight for these investments through ITS projects programmed in the TIP. He stated that the expansion of ITS on freeways is determined by MAG in partnership with ADOT, and that Transit ITS projects are separately funded and implemented by the transit agencies. The Plan will serve as the overall framework for making strategic investments in ITS across the region.

A brief overview of the background was provided next. It was pointed out that the previous Plan was developed in 2001 and that a number of key ITS planning tools and regional strategies have been developed since then – some of which are recognized as best practices in the nation. Mr. Joshua referred to the challenge in ITS planning due to the difficulty in forecasting technology trends. Due to this uncertainty combined with the uncertainty on future funding, the approach taken in the ITS Strategic Plan was more focused on program areas than on specific future projects.

Mr. Joshua also explained how the Plan addressed Federal regulations that require a Congestion Management Process when programming new projects and also how the Plan aligned with the RTP.

He stated that the goals identified in the Plan will be addressed through priorities established for improved operations on freeway, arterials, and transit systems and improvements in road safety. One of the priorities will address Integrated Corridor Management or the efficient management of freeway-arterial corridors and Active Traffic Management, which is a proactive approach to managing traffic on freeways and arterials. He described how the Plan identified regional investment priorities and goals that will guide the TIP project programming process.

Mr. Joshua concluded by stating that the Plan recognized that the benefits of ITS comes only from efficiencies gained by effective use of this technology. This required skilled people using this technology to improve traffic operations. He referred to a chart that shows how the Plan envisions the interaction between MAG and all agencies engaged in transportation operations. The Plan also identified the supporting role of MAG through studies and technical support through the MAG Work Program by using both in-house staff expertise and consultants.

Mr. Dan Cook referred to Bluetooth technology mentioned in the Plan for gathering traffic flow information for travel time displays and stated that travel time displays on freeway signs may not be accurate because real-time traffic data was not being used by ADOT. Mr. Joshua assured Mr.

Cook and the committee that the ADOT travel times are in fact based on real-time traffic data that comes from sensors that are installed at one-mile spacing on 150 miles of the urban freeway system. He indicated that ADOT is currently investigating the possible use of third party traffic data in the future to expand travel time information displays beyond the current 150 miles, but that all of the current freeway travel time displays are based on real-time traffic speed data.

Mr. Jeff Martin from Mesa motioned approve the 2012 MAG ITS Strategic Plan. Mr. John Hauskin seconded, and the motion passed with unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

Mr. Naimark left the meeting.

#### 9. Grand Canyon State Logo Sign Program

Chairman Meinhart invited Mr. Jacoby, ADOT to present the Grand Canyon State Logo Sign Program.

Mr. Jacoby indicated that there was a brochure and comment form at the table for the committee members. He told them to fill out the comment card and leave with Alice Chen who will return them to the program staff at the end of the meeting. Mr. Jacoby introduced Mr. Win Holder of the Grand Canyon State Logo Sign (GCSLS) program.

Mr. Holder presented a brief presentation about the GCSLS program, including background, pricing, and mobility. The signs, also currently referred to as Big Blues, provide information about restaurants, lodging, and other businesses relevant to the motoring public. For 25 years, it was managed by a private vendor but the program has since transitioned to ADOT. ADOT is taking over in order to provide additional funds to highway program. The signs are currently restricted to rural communities. GCSLS is launching a similar program in urban locations including metro Phoenix, Tucson, and Flagstaff in the third quarter of calendar year 2013, early fiscal 2014.

Currently these six categories qualify under MUTCD regulation. Business may have signs available either by direct three mile radius, or indirect, 15-mile radius.

- Food
- Gas
- Lodging
- 24-hour pharmacies
- Attractions
- Camping

Initial estimates identify 300 potential exits for logo signs in urban area. Currently, there are approximately 1,200 operating leases on ADOT signs along rural state routes and interstate highways representing travel-related businesses. The signs may be on the exited road or a cross street. If located on a cross street, pathfinder signs are required (municipality support/approval). Signs are owned and maintained by ADOT. Rules are currently being developed with a public hearing process.

Mr. Holder stated that GCSLS will develop a pricing structure reflective of market dynamics for each exit. The goal is to provide a service to motorists by informing them of travel related

businesses available at various locations, improving business identification along urban area highways, and providing additional revenue to the State Highway User Revenue Fund.

Mr. Grant Anderson asked about integration with the sign code of the local community. Mr. Holder said the focus would be on the major interstate sections first. They would work closed with the communities to municipalities with the intention of being an asset to the business community and that no ROW and other beautification issues are impacted.

Mr. Martin inquired about controlling for excess number signs given the number of exits urban areas. Mr. Holder responded the placement would be at the agency's discretion.

Mr. Cook questioned the ownership scenario between ADOT and the local agency when located off the freeway.

Mr. Johnson also expressed concern about the number of signs per mile and requested additional policy direction.

Mr. Holder responded that the number of signs that can be placed between exits and other signs is limited by MUTCD and ADOT is currently engaged in the rules process. In the urban area nothing would be located less than 600-feet apart. In 35% of engineer analysis and in most cases there would be one or two signs between exits.

Chairman Meinhart stated Scottsdale tries to minimize the number of signs in the City and public ROW and this may fall into that type of conversation.

Chairman Meinhart inquired if there were any questions or comments. There were none, and he proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

#### 10. 2012 Annual Report on Status of the Implementation of Proposition 400

Chairman Meinhart invited Mr. Herzog, MAG Senior Project Manager, to present the 2012 Annual Report on Status of the Implementation of Proposition 400.

Mr. Herzog explained that Arizona Revised Statute 28-6354 requires that MAG annually issue a report on the status of projects funded through Proposition 400. These programs include:

- Freeway Life Cycle Program
- Arterial Life Cycle Program
- Transit Life Cycle Program

Mr. Herzog iterated that long range Regional Revenues continue to decline. The forecasts through FY 2026 include 23.7% decrease in half-cent tax in FY 2011, and 3.4% decrease in half-cent tax in FY 2012. . In FY 2012 there has been an 4.8% increase in half-cent tax, 0.5% increase in HURF. Half-cent receipts for FY 2012 remain 17.3% lower than those in FY 2007.

Life Cycle Programs Rebalanced. There is continued recurrence of an imbalance between projected costs and expected revenues in the Life Cycle Programs due to lower revenue forecasts. All Life Cycle Programs rebalanced in 2012.

- Freeway Program: 5/23/12
- Transit Program: 5/17/12
- Arterial Program: 9/26/12

Mr. Herzog iterated that long range Regional Revenues continue to decline. The forecasts through FY 2026 include 23.7% decrease in half-cent tax in FY 2011, and 3.4% decrease in half-cent tax in FY 2012. . In FY 2012 there has been an 4.8% increase in half-cent tax, 0.5% increase in HURF. Half-cent receipts for FY 2012 remain 17.3% lower than those in FY 2007.

Mr. Herzog indicated that there was continued recurrence of an imbalance between projected costs and expected revenues in the Life Cycle Programs due to lower revenue forecasts. All Life Cycle Programs were rebalanced in 2012.

- Freeway Program: 5/23/12
- Transit Program: 5/17/12
- Arterial Program: 9/26/12

All the rebalancing went through the committee process and each one was approved. In spite of revenue problem the region has maintained a lot of progress. For the freeway Life Cycle Program there was significant progress during FY 2012.

Completed projects include:

- Loop 101 (I-10 to Tatum Blvd.): New HOV lanes.
- SR143 (at Loop 202 Access Road): Interchange improvements.
- Loop 202/Santan (Gilbert Rd. to I-10): New HOV lanes.
- MAG Region (Various Locations): Noise Walls.

Advertised for Bids or Under Construction include:

- SR 24 (Loop 101 to Ellsworth Rd.): Construct interim freeway.
- SR 85 (at B-8/Maricopa Rd): Reconstruct intersection.
- US 60 (Loop 101 to 71st Avenue): Roadway improvements.
- US 60 (71st Avenue to Van Buren St.): Roadway improvements.
- Loop 303/I-10: Construct new system interchange.
- Loop 303 (Thomas Rd. to Camelback Rd.): Construct new freeway.
- Loop 303 (Camelback Rd. to Glendale Ave.): Construct new freeway.
- Loop 303 (Glendale Ave. to Peoria Ave.): Construct new freeway.
- Loop 303 (Peoria Ave. to Mountain View Blvd.): Construct new freeway.
- \$433 Million Programmed for Projects in FY 2013

For the Arterial Streets Life Cycle Program there also was significant progress:

- \$103 million was reimbursed to lead agencies in FY 2012, for completed projects and projects underway.
- \$327 million has been disbursed and 30 arterial projects have been completed through FY 2012. In addition, \$31 million has been disbursed for ITS projects.
- \$61 million in reimbursements anticipated during FY 2013.

In the Transit Life Cycle Program, the LRT starter system has seen significant success. In addition, there are three LRT extensions scheduled for completion in 2016. On the bus side, 19 bus routes have been started up and with funding maintained for ongoing services.

Significant progress since the start of program includes:

Expanded Bus Service:

- 11 BRT routes implemented.
- 8 Regional bus grid routes implemented.
- 8 Additional new bus routes over next five.
- Ongoing operations funding.

LRT Extensions:

- Northwest Extension (Phase I) completion in FY 2016.
- Central Mesa LRT Extension completion in FY 2016.
- Tempe Streetcar completion in FY 2016.

Light Rail Starter Segment:

- 42,000 boardings per day -- 50 percent higher than projected.
- Half-cent sales tax for elements of the support infrastructure.
- No half-cent sales tax for operations funding.

The Audit of the Regional Transportation Plan resulted in a positive finding. There was no substantial evidence to warrant drastic modifications to the transportation system (plan) or specific projects. There also was a series of planning process recommendations. MAG, RPTA and ADOT are currently pursuing those issues jointly. The Audit provided 27 recommendations aimed at more efficient and effective implementation of the RTP, as well as stronger accountability for the performance of the plan.

Several ongoing issues remain. Economic recovery and transportation revenue collections are still 17% behind 2007. Recent Federal transportation funding legislation is only for two years. Project scope/cost updates and program adjustments will need to be monitored. MAG will continue to implement recommendations of the Performance Audit.

Chairman Meinhart inquired if there were any questions or comments. There were none, and he proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

#### 11. Request for Future Agenda Items

Chairman Meinhart requested a Map 21 update next month.

#### 12. Member Agency Update

Mr. Terry Johnson extended his congratulations to Mr. John Bullen, formerly from City of Glendale, for his new position at MAG.

### 13. Next Meeting Date

Chairman Meinhart informed members in attendance that the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Committee would be held on Thursday, December 13, 2012 at 10:00 a.m. in the MAG Office, Saguaro Room. There being no further business, Chairman Meinhart adjourned the meeting at 11:42 a.m.